

House of Representatives to respond to the Coast Guard by ensuring they have the resources they need to carry out their missions in the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have joined with my Committee Chairman, Mr. LOBIONDO, in crafting language in this bill that not only provides the appropriations and authorizations for the Coast Guard, but more importantly, gives proper recognition and gratitude for their efficient response to the Hurricane disaster. Make no mistake of it Mr. Speaker, while there was confusion and chaos, it was the Coast Guard that was there, on the ground saving lives.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF  
REPRESENTATIVE LLOYD MEEDS

**HON. RICK LARSEN**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, September 15, 2005*

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today we mourn. We also remember. We mourn the loss of a public servant who worked to make government the best it could be. We remember his accomplishments and celebrate his legacy.

And we take heart in the memories that we share of this great man.

Congressman Lloyd Meeds was not a distant politician. He was a friend and a neighbor whose public work was devoted to maintaining and improving our unique quality of life for generations to come. He was, in the words of his colleague Congressman Morris Udall, "a workhorse rather than a showhorse", a "glutton for the tough, detailed work that so many of us shun."

These words paint an accurate picture of a true public servant and statesman. And they set a standard of excellence for those of us now serving in Congress.

Congressman Meeds's tough, detailed work played a major role in creating Head Start and the Youth Conservation Corps. He took a stand as one of the first to support Title IX, the law that bans gender discrimination in our schools.

He set an example for me personally with his work to preserve and protect land for future generations by brokering the North Cascades Act that created the North Cascades National Park and the Alpine Lakes Wilderness. He later worked for a resolution to ensure passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, a vital piece of legislation that will protect some of the most pristine land in the United States for generations to come.

His accomplishments were many, and his commitment to the Pacific Northwest was unyielding. That commitment certainly did not end when he left Congress.

The State of Alaska declared February 28, 2005 "Lloyd Meeds Day" as a heartfelt thank-you for the Congressman's lifetime of effort on behalf of the environment and Native Americans.

This is the legacy of Congressman Lloyd Meeds—a passionate and tireless advocate for the causes he embraced.

We mourn a loss today. Congressman Meeds will be missed. The foundation he laid, however, provides the basis for the diversity

and strength we see in our communities today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR.**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, September 15, 2005*

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, my absence today from the House chamber is due to my traveling to New Orleans and Oklahoma City to assess the damage and relief efforts in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. My return to Washington, DC is not possible until after conclusion of today's legislative business. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security I am involved in the direct funding of our government's efforts in saving lives, stabilizing this devastated area, restoring order, mitigating still uncertain conditions, and beginning the rebuilding process that can assist in returning prosperity and making people whole. During my visit to New Orleans, I will witness firsthand the scope of the devastation, observe relief operations, and meet with some of the more than 2,100 members of the Oklahoma Army National Guard serving in New Orleans. My trip concludes with my traveling to Oklahoma City to meet with hurricane evacuees and relief workers.

Since Hurricane Katrina made landfall on the Gulf Coast August 31, Oklahomans have been at the forefront of relief efforts. Since August 30, the Oklahoma National Guard has supplied four U860 Blackhawk helicopters, airlifted tens of thousands of pounds of food and water to New Orleans and supplied much-needed security and rescue efforts in the midst of looting and flooding that followed the hurricane's landfall. Oklahomans have also opened up their homes and businesses to help the relief effort, and have worked with the Red Cross in opening shelters for those evacuees throughout Oklahoma.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO  
ESTABLISH A SPECIAL INSPECTORS  
GENERAL COUNCIL FOR  
HURRICANE KATRINA

**HON. TODD RUSSELL PLATTS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, September 15, 2005*

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to establish a Special Inspectors General Council for Hurricane Katrina. As Members of Congress charged with overseeing the operation and accountability of the Federal government, we have a responsibility to ensure that all funds we authorize and appropriate are spent for their intended purposes. In the wake of the terrible devastation caused by Hurricane Katrina, we have already appropriated more than \$60 billion for the immediate relief effort, and this amount is, no doubt, only the beginning. These funds must be spent in a way that ensures that the people in the affected areas of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama are able to recover.

Assuring accountability for relief and recovery projects is imperative. The public's trust in

their government has been shaken in the aftermath of this disaster. We must assure the American people that we are being appropriately prudent with their money. Any dollar lost to fraud or waste is a dollar that does not make it to someone who is in need. This funding is too important to be misspent, and that is precisely why I am introducing this legislation today.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Finance, and Accountability, I have seen firsthand the good work of agency inspectors general. Their unique relationship with both the agencies they oversee and the Congress, to whom they report, provides an ideal check on the system. Inspectors general have long stood as a bulwark against fraud and mismanagement.

While some in the Congress have called for the appointment of one Special IG to oversee hurricane relief funding, this proposal raises concerns. The most troubling aspect of the legislation is a requirement that this Special IG be appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security within three days. This is contrary to the intent of the Inspector General Act. The IG Act requires that an IG with this much authority—one who would potentially oversee the expenditures of up to \$200 billion—be appointed by the President with the advise and consent of the Senate. Under the Special IG proposal, we would face the unworkable problem of having several IGs with Senate confirmation reporting to a political appointee who reports to one cabinet secretary.

The response to Hurricane Katrina will involve the full breadth of Federal resources. It will touch nearly every Federal agency. What we need is a coordinated response from the IGs now in place throughout government. We need IGs with institutional knowledge unique to their own agencies to work together under the leadership of the Department of Homeland Security. This Council will draw on the resources of over 5,000 auditors and investigators who are already in place today.

The hurricane relief money is being spent right now. It is important that this coordination begin as quickly as possible. We cannot take a chance on a single Special Inspector General who mayor may not have the depth and breadth of knowledge to ensure full accountability at all the Federal agencies that will be part of this effort. We have no time for a learning curve, especially when we have the ability to leverage the considerable resources already available. A Special IG Council will enable this important work, which in many cases is already underway, to be completed in the most effective manner.

HONORING THE BEDFORD  
GAZETTE

**HON. BILL SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, September 15, 2005*

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Bedford Gazette, a daily newspaper serving Bedford County, Pennsylvania. On September 21, 2005, the Bedford Gazette will celebrate its 200th anniversary. A solid institution in Bedford, I grew up with the Gazette in our family's home.

While there is no definitive list of the oldest newspapers in the United States that are still published under their original names, it is believed the Bedford Gazette is among the 30 oldest newspapers in the country. The motto of the paper: "Published continuously since 1805. One of America's oldest newspapers" stakes its historical claim. What began as a four page weekly containing mainly political reports and stories has grown to publish daily since 1950.

As with so much of my district, Bedford, Pennsylvania has had a front seat to American history. The Bedford Gazette was there as eyewitness, recording the first steps of a new nation, and there are documented reports of Gazette editors as players in that history. One editor wrote of playing billiards with John Brown when he stayed in Bedford (under an assumed name) on his way to Harper's Ferry, West Virginia, to carry out his infamous raid. Another Gazette editor announced to the country that Pennsylvanian James Buchanan would not seek re-election to the U.S. Presidency. The proximity of the famous Bedford Springs Hotel allowed the Gazette access to centuries of America's movers and shakers. Presidents James Polk, Zachary Taylor, William Henry Harrison, John Tyler, James Garfield, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Ronald Reagan all spent time at the Hotel and the Gazette was there to record it.

The Frear family of Bedford has a long history with the Gazette. In 1935 Hugo Frear became editor of the paper, and when he volunteered for service in the U.S. Navy during World War II, his wife Virginia stepped in and ran the paper herself. His son Ned would become editor, serving for 30 years and eventually his grandson Chris would take the reins for another 10. All in all, three generations of the Frear family were owners, publishers, and editors for almost 60 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the historical milestone of the Bedford Gazette, a newspaper found on all kitchen tables across the county, including my own. The Bedford Gazette is more than just a daily newspaper. It is an established tie connecting Bedford's rich history and promising future.

#### NADER STATEMENT ON ROBERTS' NOMINATION

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, September 15, 2005*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, for decades Ralph Nader has forced Washington to confront crucial issues that otherwise might be swept under the rug. True to form, he now has called to our attention an important question regarding the candidacy of John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States. His statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee on that nomination raises issues in many areas important for all of us in Congress. Important areas of focus are access to the courts.

Mr. Nader's statement follows:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
September 12, 2005.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on the nomination of Judge John G. Roberts Jr. for the

position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I ask that this statement be made part of the printed hearing record.

In 1994 I testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the nomination of Stephen G. Breyer by President Clinton to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. In that testimony I called attention to the importance of balance in the way our laws handle the challenges of corporate power in America.

I said: "For our political economy, no issue is more consequential than the distribution and impact of corporate power. Historically, our country periodically has tried to redress the imbalance between organized economic power and people rights and remedies. From the agrarian populist revolt by the farmers in the late 19th and early 20th century, to the rise of the federal and state regulatory agencies, to the surging trade unionism, to the opening of the courts for broader non-property values to have their day, to the strengthening of civil rights and civil liberties, consumer, women's and environmental laws and institutions, corporate power was partially disciplined by the rule of law."

Today it is more important than ever for all Supreme Court Justices and, in particular, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to have the inclination and wisdom to realize that our democracy is being eroded by many kinds of widely reported systemic corporate excesses. Giant multinational corporations have no allegiance to any country or community, and the devastation and other injustices they visit upon communities throughout the United States and around the globe have outpaced the countervailing restraints that should be the hallmark of government by, for and of the people. Unfortunately, the structure and scope of these hearings are not likely to devote a sufficient priority to the corporate issues of our times.

In 1816 Thomas Jefferson wrote: "I hope we shall . . . crush in its birth the aristocracy of our moneyed corporations, which dare already to challenge our government to a trial of strength and bid defiance to the laws of our country." Imagine his reaction to the corporate abuses of Enron Corp., HealthSouth Corp., Tyco, WorldCom or Adelphia Communications Corp. to name only a few, along with the drug, tobacco, banking, insurance, chemical and other toxic industries. The corporate crime and greed of today tower over the abuses of the "moneyed corporations" of Jefferson's day. The economic power of giant corporations is augmented by a flood of Political Action Committee (PAC) money and other donations that shape the quality and quantity of debate in our country and consequently drive our society to imperatives that are increasingly more corporate than civic.

You will hear about Judge Roberts from several perspectives, but it is safe to assume that questions and testimony about Judge Roberts' views on corporate power and the rule of law will be inadequate given the broad and profound impact giant corporations have on our democracy. An important procedural and substantive corollary is the important role our civil justice system plays in expanding the frontiers of justice and in giving individuals the ability to hold "wrongdoers" accountable in a court of law. "If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: Thou shalt not ration justice," said the famous jurist, Learned Hand.

Unfortunately, powerholders, corporations and other institutions which are supposed to be held accountable by the civil justice system, are striving to weaken, limit and override the province of juries and judges. Some

companies, led by insurers, have used expensive and focused media to promote the view that civil juries are too costly and too unpredictable. This narrow and short-sighted perspective is contrary to the long-standing tenets of our democracy and in particular the Seventh Amendment to our Constitution.

The civil jury system of the United States embraces a fundamental precept of tested justice: ordinary citizens applying their minds and values can and do reach decisions on the facts in cases that often involve powerful wrongdoers. This form of direct citizen participation in the administration of justice was deemed indispensable by this nation's founders and was considered non-negotiable by the leaders of the American revolution against King George III. But the civil jury is more than a process toward bringing a grievance to resolution. The civil jury is a pillar of our democracy necessary for the protection of individuals against tyranny, repression and mayhem of many kinds and for the deterrence of such injustices in the future. Our civil jury institution is a voice for and by the citizenry in setting standards for a just society. Jury findings incorporated in appellate court decisions contribute to one of the few authoritative reservoirs of advancing standards of responsibility between the powerful and the powerless—whether between companies and consumers, workers, shareholders and community or between officialdom and taxpayers or citizens in general. Knowing the evolution of the common law and the civil jury provides compelling and ennobling evidence of this progression of justice. Chief Justice William Rehnquist wrote, "The founders of our Nation considered the right of trial by jury in civil cases an important bulwark against tyranny and corruption, a safeguard too precious to be left to the whim of the sovereign, or, it might be added, to that of the judiciary."

As the hearing unfolds, I suggest that the members of the Judiciary Committee devote some time to areas beyond those that are traditionally the focus of witnesses and questioning by Committee members and ask fundamental questions about the views of Judge Roberts, a former corporate lawyer at Hogan & Hartson, regarding corporate power and the civil justice system.

In the spirit of expanding the criteria by which the Committee and the public can measure Judge Robert's judicial and civic philosophy, I offer the following questions for you to pose to the nominee. Some of the questions are narrowly focused and some are broad-gauged. But, in their totality they constitute the broad kind of "litmus test" that should be applied in selecting and confirming all judges. In short, does the nominee, having met the threshold requirements of competency, believe that the rule of law should be used to broaden and deepen, procedurally and substantively, our democracy—even if it means the rights of the giant corporation or powerful interests must be circumscribed to protect the rights of the individual citizen and of our communities—rural or urban, large or small?

In pursuing its own line of questions, the Committee should not let its exploration of the nominee's views be artificially restricted. Judicial nominees have given two reasons for refusing to answer questions, but these reasons are contradictory. First, they say, if they publicly express their views, it will compromise them if the issue comes before the Court. Second, they say, judges do not decide legal issues in a vacuum: they only decide a concrete dispute in a specific adversarial context. Accordingly, some nominees claim it's silly or inappropriate, for example, to say whether they believe the Constitution protects the right to abortion, because Justices don't decide cases by asking